

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

QA3 FINANCIAL CORP.,)	8:11CV327
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	MEMORANDUM
)	AND ORDER
FELICIANA BANK AND TRUST)	
COMPANY, FELICIANA BANK)	
ANT TRUST COMPANY PROFIT)	
SHARING PLAN, and CATLIN)	
SPECIALITY INSURANCE)	
COMPANY,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

This matter is before the court on Appellant's motion to change caption (filing [9](#)) and The Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors' motion for leave to file brief as amicus curiae (filing [11](#)). The court will address each motion in turn.

Appellant asks the court to change the caption in the above-captioned case to: QA3 Financial Corp., Appellant, v. Catlin Specialty Insurance Company, Appellee ("Amended Caption"). (Filing [9](#).) Appellant believes the Amended Caption better reflects the procedural posture of the case. Appellant's motion is unopposed. (*See* Docket Sheet.) The court agrees with Appellant and the motion will be granted.

Also pending is The Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors' motion for leave to file brief as amicus curiae. (Filing [11](#).) The motion is unopposed and it is hereby granted.

IT IS ORDERED:

1. Appellant's motion to change caption (filing [9](#)) is granted. Hereafter, the parties may use the following caption for any pleadings filed in this matter: QA3 Financial Corp., Appellant, v. Catlin Specialty Insurance Company, Appellee.

2. The Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors' motion for leave to file brief as amicus curiae (filing [11](#)) is granted.

DATED this 30th day of November, 2011.

BY THE COURT:

s/ Richard G. Kopp

United States District Judge

*This opinion may contain hyperlinks to other documents or Web sites. The U.S. District Court for the District of Nebraska does not endorse, recommend, approve, or guarantee any third parties or the services or products they provide on their Web sites. Likewise, the court has no agreements with any of these third parties or their Web sites. The court accepts no responsibility for the availability or functionality of any hyperlink. Thus, the fact that a hyperlink ceases to work or directs the user to some other site does not affect the opinion of the court.